

## Extension IPM Coordination and Support Programs – FY 2009

### FAQ – Frequently Asked Questions

**Q:** *What is the earliest start date that can be proposed?*

**A:** March 1 is a reasonable date based on the current schedule. The effective date of an award will be determined by the date an award is recommended. See Part VI of the RFA for more information.

**Q:** *Can there be overlap between awards?*

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** *If a proposal is funded but reduced, would the funding have to be spent as reduced?*

**A:** Remembering that a program must have at least two Areas of Emphasis, there would be some flexibility in how the funds are re-budgeted, but the approved funding will reflect a plan to accomplish certain goals and the spirit of that approved plan should still be followed. Please see Parts V and VI of the RFA for more information.

**Q:** *Can a proposal combine two areas of emphasis (ex: Housing and Urban), with the same PD and proposed outcomes?*

**A:** The projects areas could be complimentary and functions may overlap, but the budget justification still needs to remain separate and show how funds would be applied to each area of emphasis. Please see Parts I B and II C of the RFA for more information.

**Q:** *What does a 0-5 scale look like in rating a proposal component?*

**A:** Think of it as a letter grade F-D-C-B-A where 5 is an A; or a scale of “do not fund” – poor – fair – good - excellent; or “do not fund” - low priority - medium priority - high priority - outstanding. Please see Part V B of the RFA for more information

**Q:** *Are all bets off regarding previous funding levels?*

**A:** Recommended funding levels for successful applications will be determined by the peer review results and the award process. Please see Parts V B and VI for more information.

**Q:** *Will the panel downgrade the total proposal funding request if a PD asks for too much money or will they discard the proposal?*

**A:** The proposal could be placed in the “do not fund” category if the coordination component is very weak. Otherwise the reasonableness/appropriateness of the budget is the guidance given to the panel. They will assess the merit of the proposed work. The other way a proposal could be placed in “do not fund” is if there are not a minimum of two Areas of Emphasis remaining in the fundable category. The panel can also indicate budgets that are excessive, based on the proposed activities, and recommend reduction. Please see Parts V B and VI for more information.

**Q:** *How can budgets address core staff needs with such a low limit (\$25,000) for the coordination component?*

**A:** Salaries may be included in the sub-budgets for several Areas of Emphasis. That level of detail should be reflected in the budget narrative. Please see Part IV B for more information.

**Q:** *How are livestock and poultry addressed in the RFA?*

**A:** Admittedly, livestock are not the best fit with the language of the RFA. However, there are opportunities within the conservation component. While the specific language talks about crops, livestock could conceivably fit in the High value/high input crop area of emphasis as well. It will depend on what the focus of the livestock IPM project where best to place it in your proposal. We encourage stakeholders to provide input for the development of the

next RFA. Please see the Stakeholder Input section on page 2 of this RFA for more information.

**Q:** *Will this program allow for administering a mini-grants program?*

**A:** Mini-grants would be considered appropriate and will be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria found in Part V B of this RFA.

**Q:** *Is there a place for stakeholder letters of support?*

**A:** Stakeholder letters can be attached as an "other attachment" on the project information form. Please see Part IV B 2. c. for more information.

**Q:** *Is it possible to have a co-PD included in parts of the proposal outside the coordination component?*

**A:** Yes, personnel can be accounted for in any of the budget areas. However, a collaborator from your institution does not qualify your institution to claim a collaboration component. That must be tied to a different entity entirely. The budget sheet will call for an aggregation of the main budget lines. In the justification you will need to include a section that explains why you need the funds that you have requested **AND** you must also include a breakdown by program component. Please see Part IV B for more information.

**Q:** *Can a private sector partner serve as the collaborator?*

**A:** Yes. How you choose to share funding with that partner is up to the PD and collaborator to work out, and should be reflected in your budget. Please see Part III A for more information.

**Q:** *Do all PDs submit CVs, and forms for Conflict of Interest, Current and Pending, etc.?*

**A:** Yes. All PDs and key personnel listed on the proposal must submit the standard set of forms. Please see Parts I B and IV B for more information.

**Q:** *What if someone accidentally submits a second proposal from the institution?*

**A:** By rule, both proposals are excluded from review. Please work closely with your grants offices to ensure that this does not happen. Designating an individual to approve all submissions should help prevent the problem. **NOTE:** All proposals must be submitted by or accompanied by a letter of support from the Extension Director/Extension Administrator. This serves as an additional check that only one proposal per project type is submitted from each institution. Please see Part I B for more information

**Q:** *Who will review the proposals?*

**A:** A large panel of extension specialists and researchers with a strong understanding of extension is being recruited to serve as reviewers. No reviewers will evaluate any proposals from their own region. Ad hoc reviewers may be recruited as needed. Please see Part V for more information.

**Q:** *If a state IPM initiative crosses two areas of emphasis (e.g. Housing and Urban) with the same lead individuals, very similar proposed outcomes, and the same stakeholder groups, should the applicant separate the proposal's discussion into two separate sections or can they be combined? Will the budgets and budget justification need to be separated?*

**A:** Yes. For budget analysis we would need to see the breakdown separately. Otherwise there is a lot of potential overlap in possible programming in those two areas of emphasis. The areas of emphasis could conceivably be described together in the project description, but the heading and text will have to clearly define where one project stops and the other starts. Please see Parts I B and IV B for more information.

**Q:** *Can a 'Support' proposal include both an evaluation and Critical issues project?*

**A:** No. The intent is to allow the opportunity for as many institutions as possible to receive funding. There is a limit of one application in the support area per institution. Please see Part I B for more information.

**Q:** *Where would fire ant management programs fit?*

**A:** As with any other pest, fire ant programs could fit in several areas of emphasis, Urban/Consumer IPM, IPM in Schools, IPM in Housing, and IPM on Recreational Lands are all possible fits for a fire ant program.

**Q:** *Are logic models required for each component?*

**A:** Logic models are encouraged and can be built as an overall program logic model or as specific logic models for each component as space allows.

**Q:** *How can the applicant demonstrate the collaboration of a Federal partner?*

**A:** Beyond the traditional language used to describe the federal-state-county partnership, partners for this purpose might include other federal agencies such as Department of the Interior (National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management ), US Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and others. Each collaborating Federal partner will be responsible for providing documentation to meet this requirement within agency specific guidelines.

**Q:** *Will there be a uniform date for reporting?*

**A:** Reporting will depend on the start date for the project and will be based on the 12 month duration. Reporting will now be done through CRIS rather than PPRS. Please see Part IV B for more information

**Q:** *Will there be an evaluation component to the Coordination and Collaboration component?*

**A:** Yes. The collaboration component will be evaluated through the mechanism defined in the area(s) of emphasis that it links to. Please see Part I B for more information.